

A STUDY IN THE ORIGINS OF DISTINGUISHED LIVING AMERICANS

ROY HINMAN HOLMES
University of Michigan

ABSTRACT

A study of the 1924-25 edition of *Who's Who in America* reveals the fact that the cities have been more than twice as productive of individuals of eminence as the rural districts. It also appears that during the period 1840-90 the cities' ratio of productivity suffered a significant decline. It is argued that the reasons for the differences found must be sought mainly in the field of environment. Various social factors operative in both urban and rural districts contributed to the improved showing made by the latter. In the cities, the members of the less privileged classes increased in numbers at a more rapid rate than the total population, while in the rural portion of the nation the opposite was the case, the better privileged business and professional classes making a disproportionate gain in numbers. Other factors operative in the country which aided in increasing the proportionate numbers of rural-born individuals of distinction were bettered means of communication, including the growth in numbers of small towns, and of higher institutions of learning located in rural communities. The family-unit system in agriculture is an important negative factor from the standpoint of the rural contribution of men and women of distinction. The 21,600 names considered were grouped into twelve occupational divisions for purposes of comparison. While the city has been more productive than the country in the case of all the occupational divisions except agriculture, its proportionate productivity has been much the greatest in the case of artists, and somewhat the least of all in the case of educators.

The following study is based on the thirteenth edition of *Who's Who in America*. With each new edition, the list of names is considerably altered. That of the thirteenth contains 25,357 biographies, 2,774 of which had not appeared before. One thousand six hundred and ninety-five biographies appearing in the twelfth edition were omitted from the thirteenth. I have used the sketches of 21,600 native-born Americans who furnish data adequate to cover the desired points.

Each of the 21,600 individuals was listed by occupational designation and by place and date of birth. Also, the individuals were classified into twelve occupational groups. The next step was to indicate in which census period each individual's birth occurred. For example, all individuals born between July, 1865, and June, 1875, inclusive, were listed as of the 1870 period. Next, the census publications were consulted to ascertain the population, for the census



Ann Arbor 1929

year indicated, of the birthplace of each individual. If the population proved to be 8,000 or above, it was listed "urban"; if below that number, "rural." The 8,000 division point between rural and urban was taken because it is the only point of division that the United States Census Bureau has used throughout the period under consideration. The whole number was studied to ascertain rural-urban distribution by census periods, also to ascertain rural-urban distribution of each of the twelve occupational groups.

Table I shows that the cities have in each decade produced more than their proportionate share of distinguished individuals. The percentage furnished by the cities is 36.57; while in 1870, but

TABLE I
RURAL-URBAN DISTRIBUTION OF THE BIRTHPLACES OF DISTINGUISHED
AMERICANS, SHOWING THE DECADE OF BIRTH

Census	No. of Individuals born in each decade	Rural	Urban	Percentage of Urban in Total Population	Percentage of Urban among the 21,600 Names
1820.....	2	1	1		
1830.....	49	42	7	6.72	14.28
1840.....	593	435	158	8.52	26.64
1850.....	2,391	1,669	722	12.49	30.19
1860.....	5,859	3,916	1,943	16.13	33.16
1870.....	7,289	4,563	2,726	20.93	37.40
1880.....	4,309	2,538	1,771	22.57	41.10
1890.....	1,055	526	529	29.20	50.14
1900.....	53	9	44	33.10	83.01
Totals.....	21,600	13,699	7,901		36.57

20.93 per cent of the total population were living in cities. As a much larger number of the individuals considered were born before 1870 rather than after that date, and as the proportion of urban residents becomes constantly smaller the farther back we go, we may say that the less than 20 per cent urban portion of the total population has produced more than 36 per cent of the individuals studied.

While in each census period, the urban group has exceeded its proportionate share by a considerable amount, the tendency has in general been one of the decreasing excess. If the results for the 1830 and 1900 periods be disregarded, as based upon groups too small to be representative, we find that there has been a nearly

continuous and somewhat marked decline in urban excess productivity of eminent individuals. This fact is brought out by Tables II, III, and IV.

TABLE II

RATIO OF URBAN-BORN INDIVIDUALS IN *Who's Who* TO URBAN POPULATION

Census	Urban-born in <i>Who's Who</i>	Urban Population	Ratio
1840 . . .	158 :	1,453,994 ::	1 : 9,202
1850 . . .	722 :	2,897,586 ::	1 : 4,013
1860 . . .	1,943 :	5,072,256 ::	1 : 2,610
1870 . . .	2,726 :	8,071,875 ::	1 : 2,961
1880 . . .	1,771 :	11,450,894 ::	1 : 6,465
1890 . . .	529 :	18,327,987 ::	1 : 34,646

TABLE III

RATIO OF RURAL-BORN INDIVIDUALS IN *Who's Who* TO RURAL POPULATION

Census	Rural-born in <i>Who's Who</i>	Rural Population	Ratio
1840 . . .	435 :	15,615,459 ::	1 : 35,897
1850 . . .	1,669 :	20,294,290 ::	1 : 12,158
1860 . . .	3,916 :	26,371,065 ::	1 : 6,734
1870 . . .	4,563 :	30,486,496 ::	1 : 6,681
1880 . . .	2,538 :	38,704,889 ::	1 : 15,250
1890 . . .	526 :	44,619,727 ::	1 : 84,828

TABLE IV

RATIO OF RURAL-BORN TO URBAN-BORN IN *Who's Who* IN PROPORTION TO THE NUMBERS OF EACH GROUP IN THE TOTAL POPULATION

Census	No. of Urban Population Represented by Each In- dividual Contributed	No. of Rural Population Represented by Each In- dividual Contributed	Ratio
1840 . . .	9,202 :	35,897 ::	1 : 3.90
1850 . . .	4,013 :	12,158 ::	1 : 3.02
1860 . . .	2,610 :	6,734 ::	1 : 2.58
1870 . . .	2,961 :	6,681 ::	1 : 2.25
1880 . . .	6,465 :	15,250 ::	1 : 2.35
1890 . . .	34,646 :	84,828 ::	1 : 2.44

The information given in these three tables may be stated more concisely, as follows: In 1840, it took a rural population of about 36,000 to produce each individual yet living who found his way into *Who's Who*, while it took but about 9,000 urban population to produce such an individual. In other words, in 1840, the urban

part of our population was about four times as productive of distinguished men and women as the rural. By 1870, urban productivity of such individuals was but two and a quarter times as great as rural. In 1880, the cities' relative productivity had apparently increased slightly; and in 1890, the cities' apparent showing was still better, although not as good as it had been in 1860.

A large share of the distinguished individuals born in the 1840 and 1850 periods are no longer living, hence are not included in this study. Obviously, if there is any great difference between the average age at death of rural- and urban-born men of distinction, the accuracy of the figures for the earlier periods is correspondingly affected. It seems fairly safe to assume, however, that on the average, the rural-born live at least as long as the urban-born. If their average age of death is greater than that of the urban-born, then the cities' relative productivity in the 1840 and the 1850 periods was even greater than is indicated in the tables.

There seems to be good reason to believe that the cities' apparently improved showing in the 1880 and 1890 periods is due entirely to the fact that the urban-born achieve distinction at an earlier age than the country-born. That this latter is a fact is indicated by consideration of the very small 1900 group (Table I). Forty-four of the 53 individuals here represented were urban-born. Twenty-five of the 44 are artists. The art group, which is one of the larger occupational divisions into which the whole number is divided, is the most urban in birth of all, as will be shown later; and, as indicated by the analysis of the 1900 group, artists achieve distinction, in general, the earliest of all. Presumably the 1890 and 1880 figures are influenced to a lesser extent by this factor which has so obviously distorted the results for 1900.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIMINISHING RATIO OF URBAN PRODUCTIVITY

In 1909, Dr. Frederick A. Woods remarked that "the failure to find a higher ratio for the cities [than for the country] would have been a serious blow for heredity."¹ Looking at the matter from his point of view, surely the *diminishing ratio* for the cities is an equally serious blow for heredity. If, as Dr. Woods believed,

¹ *Science*, XXX, 20.

and is very likely true, the cities are being continually enriched biologically at the expense of the country by a migration cityward of the more capable stocks, and if, as he also believed, heredity is able to determine one's relative place in life almost, if not quite, independently of social conditions, then the cities must show not alone a higher ratio than the country but an increasingly higher ratio as time goes on and as the migration continues. The markedly decreasing urban ratio that has been shown to exist evidently means that one or the other of Woods's assumptions is false. Either the migration of the best family stocks is away from the city rather than toward it or else his conception of the relation of heredity to environment is unsound. As there is no reason to assume the former of these possibilities to be a fact, the latter is presumably the case. The evidence seems to make for such a conclusion, even were one ignorant of the newer view of heredity as presented during the past few years by such eminent biologists as Child, Davenport, Herrick, and Jennings, who seem to agree, to quote the last mentioned, that "every individual has many sets of 'innate' or 'hereditary' characters; the conditions under which he develops determine which set he shall bring forth."²

The cities' superior showing as compared with the country is due to a more favorable combination therein of the factors of heredity and environment. The cities' position has been one of declining superiority. Whether the forces producing this change have been mainly operative within the city or the country, one cannot expect to determine with certainty.

Whether the somewhat general assumption that the country stock has been appreciably depleted by urban migration is valid may be seriously questioned. Without doubt, of the country young people who have shown themselves to be unusually capable, the cityward movement has been well marked. And if it were true, as is quite likely the usual belief, that inherent predispositions surely manifest themselves, then such a cityward movement would actually represent rural biological depletion. In view, however, of Jennings' statement, such a belief is clearly untenable. Obviously, there is a real possibility that farm conditions have been such that

² *Scientific Monthly*, XIX, 233.

the most of the very finest of such ability has never come to expression. The very most that can be said with safety upon this point is that *possibly* the urban stock has been enriched somewhat at the expense of the country.

Whatever may be the actual situation regarding the relative hereditary values of city and country, the truth probably is that while the question is an interesting one, it is of no real significance as far as our present problem is concerned. Every social class and type of community produces many individuals with hereditary potentiality equal to that of its few distinguished contributions to society. No other conclusion seems possible on the basis of the justifiable assumption that the environment everywhere falls short of ideal efficiency. Certain individuals are raised to places of distinction through the favorable working together in their cases of the forces of heredity and environment. Others with as good a heredity fall far short of distinguished achievement because of the lack of favoring environmental stimuli.

While there are, in each social class and type of community, hereditary limits to the numbers of significant musicians, painters, scholars, and engineers which the best environment imaginable would be able to develop—and there is no reason to suppose the limits to be the same in the various groups—surely the environment always and everywhere falls far short of ideal efficiency in the process of bringing into highest expression the potentialities available.

Without doubt certain social changes within the cities themselves are in part responsible for their declining superiority. For one thing, they have been becoming larger, and it has been shown³

³ A study by Professor Stephen S. Vischer, appearing in 1925 (*American Journal of Sociology*, XXX, 551), made for the purpose of determining relative productivity in terms of American individuals of distinction, arrived at the following values:

As to type of birthplace:

Suburb of large city	10.9
Village (up to 8,000)	8.9
Small city (8,000-50,000)	6.1
Large city (50,000—)	5.6
Farm	1.0

[Footnote continued on next page.]

that the small cities have made a slightly better record than those of over 50,000 population. In 1840, 48 per cent of the entire urban population of the United States were living in cities of more than 50,000 population; in 1890, these larger cities contained 64 per cent of the total. Presumably, however, the increasing size of the cities has merely accompanied their diminishing superiority instead of having been at all a cause for it.

According to Vischer's findings, the laboring classes, both unskilled and skilled, have been very much less productive of eminence than the business and professional classes. Business families have produced twenty times as many distinguished individuals in proportion to their numbers as has the *skilled* labor group. While the cities have been growing larger, the members of the laboring classes have been increasing in numbers much more rapidly than has the business group. In 1890, the number of business establishments in the cities was less proportionately to the size of the cities than was the case in 1840, the size of the plants was greater, and the average number of employees to each employer was larger.

This tendency toward concentration is general throughout industry. And this means that the more favorably situated groups in the cities in 1890 formed a smaller proportion of the total population than was the case in 1840. And this condition, through its development, one would suppose to have been an important factor in reducing the cities' margin of superiority over the country, unless the same sort of transition was also in effect there.

As a matter of fact, however, the opposite sort of development has been effective in the country. In 1840, the farming population, at all times the dominant rural occupational group, formed a much larger proportion of rural society than was the case in 1890. At the earlier date, a large share of the business and professional services in country districts was performed by the farmers themselves. As

As to occupations of fathers:

Clergyman	2,400
Professional man (other than clergyman) .	1,035
Business man	600
Farmer	70
Laborer (skilled)	30
Laborer (unskilled)	1

the communities became older, better settled, and more closely united to the cities, a more complete division of labor very naturally developed. Specialized business and professional groups, closely related in interests and in point of view to those of the cities, gradually became a more important element in rural society.

Vischer showed that the rural towns have been relatively about nine times as productive of eminent individuals as the open country. Pioneer areas are naturally, in general, little else than open country for some years after they have been occupied by settlers. Small towns gradually spring up and develop, in most cases, to serve the surrounding farms in a business and professional way. Obviously, rural America in 1890 was much better supplied with towns than was the case in 1840. As small towns are relatively much better represented in *Who's Who* than are the farms, the great increase in numbers of towns and of the total town population, as compared with that of the open country, must have been an important factor in increasing the ratio of rural births of eminent individuals.

It may or may not be true, as has often been said, that it is the brighter boys from the surrounding farms who become the small-town business and professional men. Whether or not the best of rural *capacity* tends to concentrate itself in the small towns, it is obviously the case that the best of rural opportunity is located there. It is in the towns that the best schools are found, and it is there that the best music and lectures are to be heard. Children living in the town have a more ready access to such cultural advantages as are to be found in them than have their farm-born cousins, partly because of physical nearness, partly also because of their greater freedom in general from the necessity of long hours of work. And, again, children of business and professional men may through family encouragement and influence be started on paths of development which may lead to eminence in the parental occupations or in others closely allied to them. The farmer's son may also through family aid be helped to become very successful in the occupation of his father. The difficulty in his case is that the nature of his father's occupation is such that relatively high success in it does not make for eminence.

One factor which is probably important in making for the high place of the small town in Vischel's scale of relative values is the tendency of the unusually successful business and professional men in such towns to move to the cities. A doctor may begin his practice in the country village and live there until his children are born. If he is especially successful and normally ambitious, he is likely to go to the large city for the sake of the social and professional advantages to be derived. His children, though born in a rural community, may get the most of their development in the city, with its added advantages. Upon the other hand, when the farmer's family moves to the city, the father is very likely, because of lack of training for anything else, to become a hand laborer; and the children are then apt to develop the labor-class point of view, which, whatever their capacities may be, is likely to stand in the way of subsequent distinguished achievement.

The rural portion of society has gained environmentally in other ways than through the development within itself of the more highly favored groups resident in the towns. Through the improvement of means of communication, including transportation, the country population as a whole has been enabled to share more and more completely the life of the cities. Thus, in so far as the city environment is superior to that of the country as a developing field for potential genius, the superiority has been lessened by a gradual but very real extension of its influences out over the countryside.

One of the most important factors in narrowing the gap between rural and urban facilities for development has been the founding of higher institutions of learning in rural districts. Most of the men mentioned in *Who's Who* are college men. "In round numbers, 77 out of every 100 persons giving educational data, whose names appear in the 1922-1923 edition, attended college, and 64 out of every 100 were college graduates."⁴ The great eastern cities and many of the smaller cities in the eastern states have all through the period under consideration been able to afford their young people the opportunity to attend college without their being

⁴ *Who's Who in America*, XIII, 27.

obliged to leave home. In the nature of the case, most country young people can never be so fortunately situated. Every college, however, that is established in a rural area makes its contribution toward increasing the ratio of the distinguished rural-born.

PROBABLE CAUSES OF THE LOW PRODUCTIVITY OF DISTINGUISHED
MEN IN THE FARMING CLASS

The farming class is such an important element of the rural population as to demand much in the way of separate consideration. In Vischer's table of relative values, the skilled laborer is rated at 30, the farmer at 70, and the business man at 600; and Vischer emphasizes the fact that "the farmers did much better than other manual laborers." It is just as true, however, and possibly more significant, that the farmers have done much worse than other business men. The farmer is a business man as well as a laborer, and the greater significance in comparing his record with that of other business men rather than with other laborers lies in the fact which Williams⁵ makes plain, that the American farmer is traditionally a member of the middle class, as are most business men, with a certain contempt for the wage-earners of the city. He manages his own undertaking, and in most cases is the owner. In a much larger proportion of cases than is true of the urban laboring class, he is native born, which fact tends to strengthen his feeling of likeness to the longer established middle- and upper-class families of the city.

What, then, are the reasons for the farmers' low rating as compared with that of business men, from the standpoint of the contribution of distinguished children to the general social life? The fact of the greater isolation of farm families from educational and other cultural influences has been considered. Just what part the farming class has played directly in the improved relative showing of the rural population as a whole is not indicated by the statistics. Supposedly, the gradual bettering of opportunity has made for an increasing proportion of distinguished successes coming from the farms. The nature of the farming occupation, however, is such that

⁵ *Our Rural Heritage* (1925).

it seems quite probable that nothing in the way of improved communication can equalize the chances for eminence of the children of farmers, generally, with the children of other middle-class families. In other words, the more essential isolation from which farm children suffer is a class or occupational isolation rather than one which can be thought of in physical terms. It consists, in part, in the fact that the occupational unit is typically the family rather than the individual. While the implications of this fact are many, there are but two which need concern us here. In the first place, it means child labor. In the second, it means family and community pressure brought to bear upon the sons to keep them in the occupation.

It is a matter of general knowledge that farmers' sons usually work with the father upon the land. The important part played by this labor of children may not be so generally understood. In Iowa, where conditions are likely as representative as may be found of American agriculture as a whole, according to Warren H. Wilson, who depends for his information upon the opinion of one whom he considers competent to speak intelligently as to conditions in that state, the margin of profit in agriculture corresponds to the margin of child labor on the farm.⁶ This statement was made prior to the World War, when agriculture was profitable in Iowa.

Just how important a factor the nature of the farmers' occupation may be in limiting the number of their children who achieve places in *Who's Who* obviously cannot be determined. That it is very important cannot be questioned. Child labor on the farm acts in a positive way to hold the children in the occupation by giving them a preparation for that life, so that by the time they arrive at the age for choosing their life-work they are likely to be well qualified to follow in the father's occupational footsteps. It acts negatively to the same end by limiting the volume and force of other suggestions. Even in cases where it doesn't prevent school attendance, or lower the quality of the work done, it is likely to act in this negative way by limiting the contacts with other sorts of occupational suggestions. Those boys who leave the farm, unless they have done well in school, are obviously shut out from the possibility

⁶ Bricker, *Solving the Country Church Problem*, p. 36.

of advancement in fields in which educational preparation is essential. And the fact that they have done poorly in school may as likely have been due to poor home conditions as to inherent inability.

The farm is a family affair. If the son can succeed his father happily and efficiently, so much the better; but whether happily or efficiently or not, he must in general succeed his father, or else through his failure to do so be the cause of a more or less serious social and industrial disorganization. Therefore the somewhat highly organized system for the purpose of manipulating the conditions of choice of farm-born young people, to the end that they remain in the parental occupation.

In the period that we are considering, 1840-90, the need for an organized influence outside of the family to be exercised in checking the cityward drift of young people was not so keenly felt. During that period, families were larger than now, and contacts with the outside world were fewer. A family succession in most cases would develop naturally. But whenever the need was felt, the force of local opinion expressed through community leaders could, in general be depended upon to assert itself upon the side of loyalty to parents, which in most cases meant a continuance in the family occupation. The "good" son was the one who "stayed at home and looked after the old folks." The one who "ran off to the city" to find his place in life was likely to be considered "rather wild" or at least a somewhat selfish sort of person. These attitudes were among the more clearly distinguishable ones in the rural community of my childhood.

We are now concerned only with the obvious fact that the nature of the farm occupation is such as to check very greatly the free flow of ability out from it into other fields, in which success might lead to eminence. Whether or not the use of propaganda to bolster up a family occupational institution in an industrial world that has mainly advanced beyond the family stage is or is not to be justified may be debated pro and con. It is enough now merely to see that the rural ratio of distinguished individuals contributed to the larger social whole has been kept down in part by the "let-us-keep-the-boy-on-the-farm" attitude.

To the extent that the farm-born are sharing in the increasing

ratio of rural-born eminence, that fact must be due to a decreasing effectiveness of the limiting forces surrounding them. The present-day propaganda-made isolation of farm youth is very likely much less complete than the more natural isolation of earlier decades.

DIVISION INTO OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

The end sought in the matter of occupational grouping was a distribution into groups few enough in number to make for simplicity of treatment, yet small enough in size to make for a reasonably high degree of homogeneity in type of interests. A division into twelve groups was adopted, as follows: business, science, education, law, politics, church, medicine, art, journalism, army and navy, engineering, and agriculture.

In certain cases, the distinctions made are somewhat arbitrary. For example, most individuals of the science group are also educators; and the greater proportion of the politically distinguished are also lawyers. The science group consist of those whose biographical sketches indicate some achievement of a productive sort in science or scholarship. The education group consists of educators whose distinction apparently rests upon achievement of an administrative or instructional nature. Librarians and social workers were placed either in the science or in the education group, depending upon whether or not they are apparently entitled to distinction for achievement in the field of productive scholarship.

Lawyers whose biographical sketches indicate that they have held public office or have been active in the field of party politics were placed in the politics group; the remainder were placed in the law group. In the art group were placed those who have won distinction either as producers or as critics anywhere in the broad field of the fine arts. The journalism group consists of all writers whose writings apparently do not entitle them to classification in either the science or the art groups. Editors and publishers are also included here.

In certain cases, an individual might have been placed in two or more of the different occupational divisions. In such cases, the art classification was arbitrarily given precedence over all others, with politics, second in this regard. Where possible, teachers were classified in their field of instruction instead of being placed in the

education group. For example, a teacher of engineering would be classed in the engineering rather than in the education group. In every case, the biographical sketches were studied to determine the classification to be made; the occupational designations which individuals give themselves are lacking in exactness to such a degree that they cannot be relied upon.

Possibly the most significant fact indicated in Table V is that, the small agriculture group excepted, the cities have contributed more than their proportionate share to every occupational group.

TABLE V
RURAL-URBAN DISTRIBUTION OF THE BIRTHPLACES OF DISTINGUISHED
AMERICANS GROUPED ACCORDING TO OCCUPATION

Occupation	Total	Rural	Urban	Percentage of Urban
1. Art.....	2,168	884	1,284	59.22
2. Business.....	2,203	1,177	1,026	46.57
3. Journalism.....	1,629	907	722	44.32
4. Engineering.....	1,142	645	497	43.52
5. Law.....	1,048	607	441	42.08
6. Medicine.....	1,584	923	661	41.72
7. Science.....	3,817	2,594	1,223	32.04
8. Army and navy.....	537	372	165	30.72
9. Church.....	1,924	1,401	523	27.18
10. Politics.....	3,238	2,424	814	25.13
11. Education.....	2,183	1,650	533	24.41
12. Agriculture.....	127	115	12	9.44
Totals.....	21,600	13,699	7,901	36.57

The urban excess is least in the case of education, but even here 24.41 per cent were urban-born, while as late as 1880 but 22.57 per cent of the population were in the cities. Art is in a class by itself from the standpoint of urban birth, being nearly 13 per cent higher in the list than business with its 46.57 per cent of city-born.

From the standpoint of rural-urban distribution, the twelve occupational groups divide very definitely into two divisions of six each, medicine and science (sixth and seventh in the list) being separated from each other in the scale by nearly 10 per cent. Such a marked division of the groups must rest upon a somewhat corresponding separation between the factors in rural and urban life which make for distinguished success in the various occupations. The country-born furnish much higher proportions of the six groups

lowest in the list than of the others. Without doubt, the greater simplicity of the rural environment is in large part responsible for this fact. Lacking the numerous suggestions of the city-born, the country boy has at least the teacher, the minister, and the local politician to turn to as models. Then, too, distinguished careers in the fields represented by these men may have, and quite frequently do have, most modest beginnings. The farm boy of good capacity, and strong ambition, although lacking money and influence, may gradually make his way to success in one of these familiar fields.

Quite likely, most boys, both rural and urban, at some time fancy themselves becoming officers of the army or navy. In general, such ambitions would find less competition in the mind of the farm boy than in that of his urban cousin. Then, too, as appointment to Annapolis and West Point is by Congressional districts, and as there are many rural districts, the rural portion of the population is bound to be well represented among the graduates of these schools.

As to the politically distinguished, the same factors make for a large rural representation. The rural portions of the population are naturally very generally served politically by rural-born officials, who, if of a certain rank, are arbitrarily given places in *Who's Who in America*. Then, too, the undoubted popular impression that in some way country birth is an asset has certainly contributed to the political success of many farm-born individuals in competition with men from the city.

The lone position of the art group at the head of the list, from the standpoint of urban birth, is sufficiently striking to call for a separate inquiry as to probable causes. This is the more true because of what probably is the popular belief that artists in general owe much to rural life for their inspiration. Almost invariably when I have asked students to arrange the twelve groups in what they would think to be the correct order, from the standpoint of urban birth, "business" has been placed at the head of the list, with "art" appearing several points below. Assuredly the city is the place of business—"hard," "impersonal," "materialistic"; while the country, with its wide open spaces, its "lowing kine," and "rippling brooks," is the realm of poetry and of song.

It may very well be, when one stops to think of it, that the city youth is in a better position to appreciate the beauties of nature than is the boy on the farm. The latter may be too much a part of nature to perceive anything in the way of art significance, even if his practical contact with it allows him to sense anything of its beauty. At any rate, birth in the city does not prevent one from experiencing rural contacts; and if one is of the more privileged urban classes, he is likely to have opportunity to travel widely and to touch life at many points, gathering to himself whatever his unique combination of natural capacity and training fits him to use.

Then, too, it is in the city that the finest examples of all of the arts are to be found. And early access to these models must be of extreme importance to the future artist. The better facilities for training are located there; and it is likely true that high success, at least in certain of the arts, is more dependent upon a good quality of early training than is the case in other fields of endeavor. Most important of all, surely, is the presence in the cities of appreciative groups of individuals who can give the capable young person the encouragement and the criticism that may spur him on his way. The great artists themselves are there, at least a part of the time; and they are but the nucleus of a much larger number of individuals who have the leisure and the inclination and the ability to make themselves useful somewhere in the wide field of the fine arts.